

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SANDRA B. TOODLE,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

PRESIDENT BARRACK OBAMA, et
al.,

Defendant(s).

2:14-CV-34 JCM (CWH)

ORDER

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Hoffman's report and recommendation. (Doc. # 3). Plaintiff Sandra Toodle has not filed objections to the report, and the deadline to do so has passed.

This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United States v.*

1 *Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the
 2 district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); *see*
 3 *also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit’s
 4 decision in *Reyna–Tapia* as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review “any
 5 issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge’s
 6 recommendation, then this court may accept the recommendation without review. *See, e.g.,*
 7 *Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge’s recommendation
 8 to which no objection was filed).

9 Nevertheless, this court finds it appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine
 10 whether to adopt the recommendation of the magistrate judge. The magistrate aptly summarized
 11 plaintiff’s history and the instant complaint as follows:

12 Plaintiff has a history of litigation in the District of Nevada and has
 13 had other, similar cases dismissed for raising fanciful claims. *See*
 14 *Toodle v. Queen Elizabeth II, et al.*, 2:13-cv-00599-MMD-NJK
 15 (Plaintiff’s complaint dismissed as it was “rife with fanciful and
 16 nonsensical allegations”); *Toodle v. United States, et al.*, 2:03-cv-
 17 00656-LRH-RJJ (dismissing complaint because the allegations were
 18 “clearly fantastic and delusional”). Here, Plaintiff seeks \$88 zillion
 19 dollars in damages in order replenish a prior account opened in
 20 Plaintiff’s behalf by Queen Elizabeth in the amount of \$86 zillion.
 Plaintiff claims that President Barack Obama had the money
 transferred from her account into his own private account in a bank
 located in Acapulco, Mexico. She further claims that Defendants
 Gwendolyn Johnson and Sharon Johnson are paying unnamed
 individuals \$1000.00 from private healthcare accounts to open
 security doors at Plaintiff’s housing complex to permit city
 employees, state employees, and police officers to brutally rape
 Plaintiff for purposes of producing pornographic materials.

21 (Doc. # 3, at 2).

22 Instead of filing objections, plaintiff has filed an “amendment” alleging, *inter alia*, that the
 23 Gold Coast Casino and Bank of America are issuing checks using her money to various schools, that
 24 the government has established a rehabilitation clinic in her apartment without her permission, and
 25 that she is being raped and tortured by unidentified individuals. (*See doc. # 6*). In addition, plaintiff
 26 has sent a letter to the court alleging that the undersigned is using her bank card to purchase meals
 27 at Caesar’s Palace, and requesting a similar card be issued to her. Plaintiff further alleges that
 28

Upon reviewing the recommendation and underlying briefs, this court finds good cause appears to ADOPT the magistrate's findings in full.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Magistrate Hoffman's report and recommendation (doc. # 3) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its entirety.

DATED March 3, 2014.

James C. Mahan
U.S. District Judge